



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,310	11/21/2005	Simon Michael French	7790-X06-022	6342
27317 7590 08/21/2007 FLEIT KAIN GIBBONS GUTMAN BONGINI & BIANCO 21355 EAST DIXIE HIGHWAY SUITE 115 MIAMI, FL 33180			EXAMINER CHEN, SHIN HON	
			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,310

Applicant(s)

FRENCH ET AL.

Examiner

Shin-Hon Chen

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 13-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-11 and 13-21 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claim 1, 2 and 8-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Coss et al. U.S. Pat. No. 7143438 (hereinafter Coss).
4. As per claim 1 and 11, Coss discloses a system for managing security domains, the system comprising: a plurality of security domains (Coss: column 3 lines 37-41), each domain comprising at least one network having a plurality of managed nodes provided therein (Coss: column 3 lines 37-42); at least one management node located in one of said plurality of security domains for controlling operation of said plurality of managed nodes in said one security domain (Coss: column 3 lines 65-67: protecting two domains and domains controller are well known in the art for controlling access to domains); and a firewall located external of said one security domain which is operationally linked to the management node in said one security domain, the firewall linking said management node with said plurality of managed nodes in said plurality of

Art Unit: 2131

security domains (Coss: column 3 lines 50-54: firewall implements security policies for the domains).

5. As per claim 2, Coss discloses the system of claim 1. Coss further discloses wherein the firewall controls the network traffic by examining the source of the traffic, the destination of the traffic, and the operational content contained within that traffic (Coss: column 4 lines 4-18).

6. As per claim 8, Coss discloses the system of claim 1. Coss further discloses wherein the firewall hosts a subset of Internet Control Management Protocol (ICMP) (Coss: column 4 lines 50-52).

7. As per claim 9, Coss discloses the system of claim 1. Coss further discloses wherein the firewall prevents communication between one managed security domain and any other managed security domain (Coss: column 3 lines 50-54: control communication between two domains).

8. As per claim 10, Coss discloses the system of claim 1. Coss further discloses wherein the firewall controls access of information by each node in a managed security domain (Coss: column 3 line 65 – column 4 line 3 and figures 5A and 5B).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2131

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 3-7 and 13-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coss in view of Keohane et al. U.S. 6795862 (hereinafter Keohane).

11. As per claim 3, Coss discloses the system of claim 2. Coss does not explicitly disclose wherein the firewall converts one management protocol to another. However, Keohane discloses converting one SNMP version to another to provide more security in communication (Keohane: column 1 lines 50-63). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to convert SNMP versions between two domains because SNMP is well known protocol for monitoring and controlling networks applied by gateways and firewalls. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Keohane within the system of Coss because it provides more security between communicating domains by upgrading all SNMP protocols to version 3.

12. As per claim 4, Coss as modified discloses the system of claim 3. Coss as modified further discloses wherein the firewall hosts Simple Network Management Protocol (SNMP) (Coss: column 6 lines 3-10: process TCP/IP packets; Keohane: column 1 lines 50-63).

13. As per claim 5, Coss discloses the system of claim 4. Coss as modified further discloses wherein, when the managing security domain hosts one version of SNMP and at least one of the

Art Unit: 2131

managed security domain hosts another version of SNMP, the firewall converts one version of SNMP to another (Keohane: column 1 lines 50-63).

14. As per claim 6, Coss discloses the system of claim 5. Coss as modified further discloses wherein the managing security domain hosts several versions of SNMP and the managed security domains hosts less secure versions of SNMP (Keohane: column 1 lines 50-63: version 3 is more secure and ought to be used by managing node).

15. As per claim 7 and 21, Coss discloses the system of claim 6. Coss as modified further discloses wherein the firewall converts SNMPv3 on the managed security domain to SNMPv2c on the managed security domains (Keohane: column 1 lines 50-63).

16. As per claim 13-17, claims 13-17 encompass the same scope as claims 3-7. Therefore, claims 13-17 are rejected based on the same reason set forth above in rejecting claims 3-7.

17. As per claim 18-20, claims 18-20 encompass the same scope as claims 8-10. Therefore, claims 18-20 are rejected based on the same reasons set forth above in rejecting claims 8-10.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shin-Hon Chen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3789. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30am to 5:30pm.

Art Unit: 2131

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shin-Hon Chen
Examiner
Art Unit 2131

SC


SYED A. ZIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER